

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/532,550	ISHII ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Louis Falasco	1794

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Louis Falasco.

(3) Carol Chaney

(2) Carl Reed.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 December 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference

c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

It was argued the instant invention produced a reduction in adverse burns over the prior art. It was also argued the prior art did not have the claimed fine density with concavity ratio. It was argued the BH were not taught in the prior art.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required